

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 15, 2005. Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 14-17, 21, 22, 26-30 and 34-37 are rejected. Claims 3-5, 11-13, 23-25 and 31-33 are objected to. Claims 18-20 and 38-40 are allowed. Claims 1, 11, 12-17, 21, 31, 32-37 have been amended. Claims 10 and 30 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11-29, and 31-40 remain pending in the present application.

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 18-20 and 38-40.

Claims 3-5, 11-13, 23-25, and 31-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 11 to recite the limitations of claims 10 and 11, and amended claim 31 to recite the limitations of claims 30 and 31. Applicant submits that amended claims 11 and 31 are allowable. Claims 14, 16, 34, and 36 have been amended to depend upon claims 11 or 31. Applicant submits claims 12-13, 14-17, 32-33, and 34-37 are allowable because they depend upon allowable base claims 11 and 31.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 21-22, 26-28, 30, 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Frost et al. (US 2003/0158708). Claims 10 and 30 have been canceled. Thus, their rejections are moot.

Per the remaining claims, the Examiner states:

...Frost et al. teaches a method for handling messages between devices in a network, comprising the steps of: (a) receiving a message for a device application by a dispatcher application (e.g., configuration application 118) on a receiving device (see paragraph [0042], [0046]); (b) determining that the device application does not exist (e.g., the software version is incompatible with the application) on the receiving device by the dispatcher application (see paragraph [0046]); and (c) sending a notification to a user of the receiving device of receipt of the message (e.g., display an error message – see paragraph [0046])...

Applicant respectfully disagrees as to the claims as amended. In accordance with the

present invention, the dispatcher application resides on a receiving device. The dispatcher application receives a message for a device application. The dispatcher application then determines if the device application exists on the receiving device. If not, then a notification is sent to a user of the receiving device of receipt of the message. This difference is significant in that the receiving device in accordance with the present invention need not connect with another device (e.g., a server) for a dispatcher application to determine whether or not a device application exists.

Thus, Frost does not teach or suggest receiving a message for a device application by a dispatcher application, wherein the dispatcher application resides on a receiving device, determining that the device application does not exist on the receiving device by the dispatcher application, and sending a notification to a user of the receiving device of receipt of the message, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 21. Claims 1 and 21 are therefore allowable over Frost. Applicant submits that claims 2, 6-8, 22, and 26-28 are also allowable because they depend upon allowable base claims 1 and 21. Applicant further submits that claims 14-16 and 34-36 are allowable because they depend upon allowable base claims 11 and 31, as set forth above.

Claims 9, 17, 29 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frost. Applicant submits that claims 9 and 29 are allowable because they depend upon allowable base claims 1 and 21, respectively, as set forth above. Applicant further submits that claims 17 and 37 are allowable because they depend upon allowable base claims 11 and 31, as set forth above.

Therefore, for the above identified reasons, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 11, 18, 21, 31, and 38 is neither taught nor suggested by Frost. Applicant further submits that claims 2-9, 12-17, 29-30, 22-29, 32-37, and 39-40 are also allowable because they depend on the above allowable base claims. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests

reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and does not appear to be any more relevant than the applied references.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

July 8, 2005_____

/Michele Liu/ Reg. No. 44,875
Michele Liu
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540